



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,421	09/08/2006	Tetsuya Uehara	255A 3876 PCT	3864
3713	7590	09/17/2008		
QUINN EMANUEL KODA & ANDROLIA 865 S. FIGUEROA STREET, 10TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90017			EXAMINER	
			FORTUNA, JOSE A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1791		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		09/17/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/581,421	Applicant(s) UEHARA ET AL.
	Examiner José A. Fortuna	Art Unit 1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-146/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/15/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Note that the current specification contains the brief description of the drawings, at the end of the specification, which is contrary to the preferred layout.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the reference to the claims in paragraphs [0006] through [0015] is not recommended and should be deleted, since the

claims can be altered or cancelled throughout the prosecution and therefore, such references must also be changed accordingly. Actually, the claims have been changed already, in the preliminary amendment and therefore, those references in must be changed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: even though formulas and acronyms are permitted in a claim, they should be defined at least in the first usage of the terms/formula, so to help the reading of the claims, i.e., the reader doesn't have to go back to find the meaning of the terms. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 4-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 4-7 the use of the phrase "a value..." renders the claim indefinite, since it is unclear to what value applicants are referring to. Note that such phrase makes the claims difficult to read, because the word "a" is/could be interpreted as a preposition, instead of the variable "a."

In claim 9, the phrase "waste pulp" lacks of sufficient antecedent basis, since the independent t claims, do not recite that such pulps could be used.

Priority

6. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-7, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phan et al., US Patent No. 5,223,096 in view of Degen et al., US Patent No. 4,383,834.

Phan et al. teach a tissue in which cationic agents, a softening agent, along with wet strength resins are added to the pulp, see abstract. Phan et al. do not teach the dyeing of the tissue as claimed. However, Degen et al. teach the coloring of papers using a dye and a cationic fixing agent, see abstract. The dye and the fixing agents can be added either to the pulp or to the formed paper, see column 3, line 42 through column 4, line 11. The dye and fixing agents seem to be the same as disclosed by applicants, see for example column 1, lines 33-53 and the cationic fixing agents, column 1, line 54 through column 3, line 41. Note that such fixing agents are compatible with the wet strength agents of Phan et al. Therefore, coloring the tissue taught by Phan et al. with the dyes and process recommended by Degen et al. would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to obtain a tissue with little bleeding, (Degen et al., column 4, lines 28-32), eliminates sidedness, (Degen et al., column 4, lines 19-21) and better dye retention, (Degen et al., column 4, lines 21-28). Note that obtaining the difference Hunter's color value as claimed is within the levels of ordinary skill in the art as an obvious optimization of the color. It has been held that "[T]he discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art. *In re Antoine*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); *In re Aller*, 42 CCPA 824, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (1995). Also, it has been held that it is obvious to try, choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions with a reasonable expectation of

success. See recent Board decision *Ex parte Smith*, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20, (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007) (Citing KSR, 82 USPQ2d at 1396).

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phan et al. in view of Degen et al. as applied to claims 1-7 and 9-10 above, and further in view of Kotani et al., WO 00/73585 A1.

Phan et al. and Degen et al. do not teach the embossing of the web as claimed. However, Kotani et al. teach a method of embossing a tissue, covering from 3-35% of it, the tissue, with an embossing pattern of distinctive lands and background matrix, see abstract and page 3, lines 10-19. The embossing produces a tissue with increase bulk, increases the live of the product, reduces the ridging and/or wrinkles from the product and increases the aesthetic appearance, column 3, lines 5-8. Therefore, embossing the tissues of the combination of references, Phan et al. and Degen et al., with the embossing pattern suggested by Kotani et al. would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to obtain the benefits discussed above.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure in the art of "Colored Tissues."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 1791

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/José A Fortuna/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1791

JAF